



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/540,361	03/31/2000	Rajeev Koodli	NC17353	2371

32294 7590 10/03/2005

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.  
14TH FLOOR  
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT  
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182

EXAMINER

JAGANNATHAN, MELANIE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2666

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/540,361

Applicant(s)

KODLI, RAJEEV

Examiner

Melanie Jagannathan

Art Unit

2666

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 5-11 and 17-22 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 12-15 and 23-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 16 is objected to because of following informalities: on line 7, "second threshold" should be changed to "second rate threshold". Applicant is requested to make similar changes to other existing informalities in claims inadvertently overlooked by Examiner. Appropriate correction is required.
2. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: on line 15 of same claim, "plurality of priority level" should be changed to "plurality of priority levels." Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al. US 6,463,068.

The claimed determining a first probability using a first algorithm, at least one second probability using a second algorithm, the first and second algorithm being different and weighting each probability so that each contribute to net

probability is disclosed by weighted average free queue depth calculation in Lin's WRED scheme. WRED packet drop probability is based on maximum and minimum thresholds and a mark probability denominator. The rate of packet drop increases linearly as the average queue size increases until it reaches the maximum threshold and the mark probability denominator is the fraction of packets dropped when the average queue depth is at maximum threshold. In WRED, the minimum threshold value should be set high enough to maximize the link utilization. If the minimum threshold is too low, packets may be dropped unnecessarily, and the transmission link will not be fully used.

Lin discloses a WRED processor (Figure 2, element 22) determines a new weighted average free queue depth using current weighted average free queue depth, a weighted factor  $W$  and the instantaneous size of free queue. The weighted average is compared with the predetermined minimum and maximum thresholds and if it falls between the thresholds, a probability of discard is calculated using weighted average value. See column 4, lines 39-67 and column 5. Examiner interprets first algorithm as determination of minimum threshold that cannot be set too low to result in unnecessary drops and second algorithm as determination of maximum threshold. Lin discloses the maximum and minimum thresholds are set relative to one another such that the loss priorities associated with the classes of service are maintained. See column 2, lines 37-39.

Art Unit: 2666

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

6. Claims 1,2-4,12,13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Feng, Wu-Chang et al. "Adaptive Packet Marking for Maintaining End-to-End Throughput in a Differentiated-Services Internet", IEEE, October 1999.

Regarding claim 1, the claimed sending rate estimate is disclosed by user or network administrator specifying a desired minimum service rate for connection or connection group. See page 685, column 2, lines 34-37, page 686, column 4, lines 18-24. The claimed probabilistically marking a packet to one of a plurality of priority levels based on sending rate estimate is disclosed by packet-marking engine for monitoring and sustaining the requested level of service by setting ToS bits in packet headers appropriately. See page 685, column 2, lines 37-45, page 686, column 1, lines 1-3. The claimed determining any credits or debits for packet stream, wherein a probability marking of the packet stream is improved while there is sufficiently accumulated credit and when a first criterion is met is disclosed by PME marks packets belonging to the connection or connection group, the fraction of marked packets varies from zero to one depending upon the measured and target throughputs such that the PME continually adjusts the fraction of packets marked in order to sustain a bandwidth close to the requested target rate while keeping number of marked packets as low as possible. See page 686, column 1, lines 11-48, page 687, lines 6-23.

Regarding claims 2-4, 12, 13-14, 15, the claimed sending rate estimate is disclosed by user or network administrator specifying a desired minimum service rate for connection or connection group. See page 685, column 2, lines 34-37, page 686, column 4, lines 18-24. The claimed probabilistically marking a packet to one of a plurality of priority levels based on sending rate estimate is disclosed by packet-marking engine for monitoring and sustaining the requested level of service by setting ToS bits in packet headers appropriately. See page 685, column 2, lines 37-45, page 686, column 1, lines 1-3. The claimed determining any credits or debits for packet stream, wherein a probability marking of the packet stream is improved while there is sufficiently accumulated credit and when a first criterion is met is disclosed by PME marks packets belonging to the connection or connection group, the fraction of marked packets varies from zero to one depending upon the measured and target throughputs such that the PME continually adjusts the fraction of packets marked in order to sustain a bandwidth close to the requested target rate while keeping number of marked packets as low as possible. See page 687, column 1, lines 11-48, page 687, column 2, lines 6-23. The claimed determining if sending rate estimate is less than first rate threshold or between a first rate threshold and second rate threshold and in response to this setting a probability of marking packet with a first selected priority level is disclosed by marking probability is periodically updated depending on observed bandwidth and corresponding target bandwidth. If observed bandwidth is less than target bandwidth, then packet marking probability is incremented which is upgrading packets belonging to the connection to highest priority level. Similarly, if observed is less than target, packet

Art Unit: 2666

marking probability is decremented to best-effort. See page 686, column 1, lines 35-49, page 687, column 1, lines 11-48, column 2, lines 6-23.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1,2-4,12,13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark et al. "Explicit Allocation of Best-Effort Packet Delivery Service", IEEE, August 1998 in view of Bechtolsheim et al. US 6,515,963.

Regarding claim 1, the claimed sending rate estimate is disclosed by expected throughput or target rate. See page 366, column 1, lines 31-34. The claimed probabilistically marking a packet to one of a plurality of priority levels based on sending rate estimate is disclosed by when average queue size has exceeded a certain threshold, RED routers drops each arriving packet with a certain probability. See page 367, lines 19-30.

Clark et al. discloses all of the limitations of the claims except for determining any credits or debits for the packet stream, wherein a probability marking of the packet stream is improved while there is sufficiently accumulated credit and when a first criterion is met. Bechtolsheim et al. discloses credit field in flow table for each indexed flow table entry so a flow over its dynamic buffer limit incurring a drop probability could

send some amount of packets to exhausts credits. Credits are incremented on enqueueing and decremented on marking or dropping. See column 10, lines 1-35, column 12, lines 1-23. Once a flow exhausts its credits or reaches a minimum credit threshold level, it is deemed non-adaptive and a separate non-adaptive flow limit is enforced for that flow. A non-adaptive flow must stay under the flow limit for several queuing operations to build up enough credits so that it will be classified as an adapting flow and allowed queue space. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clark et al. with credits and flow limits of Bechtolsheim et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do this since credit scheme ensures fair allocations of bandwidth. See column 10, lines 47-49.

Regarding claims 2-4, 12-15, the claimed sending rate estimate is disclosed by expected throughput or target rate. Different levels of service have different target rates. See page 366, column 1, lines 31-34. The claimed probabilistically marking a packet to one of a plurality of priority levels based on sending rate estimate is disclosed when average queue size has exceeded a certain threshold, RED routers drops each arriving packet with a certain probability. See page 367, lines 19-30.

The claimed determining if sending rate estimate is less than first rate threshold or between a first rate threshold and second rate threshold and in response to this setting a probability of marking packet with a first selected priority level is disclosed by parameters min threshold and max threshold where if average queue size is below min threshold, no packets are dropped. When the average queue size is between the two thresholds, each packet drop serves the purpose of reducing the sending rate and when



Art Unit: 2666

average queue size is above max threshold, then every arriving packet is dropped hoping to maintain a short queue size.

Clark et al. discloses all of the limitations of the claims except for determining any credits or debits for the packet stream, wherein a probability marking of the packet stream is improved while there is sufficiently accumulated credit and when a first criterion is met. Bechtolsheim et al. discloses credit field in flow table for each indexed flow table entry so a flow over its dynamic buffer limit incurring a drop probability could send some amount of packets to exhausts credits. Credits are incremented on enqueueing and decremented on marking or dropping. See column 10, lines 1-35, column 12, lines 1-23. Once a flow exhausts its credits or reaches a minimum credit threshold level, it is deemed non-adaptive and a separate non-adaptive flow limit is enforced for that flow. A non-adaptive flow must stay under the flow limit for several queuing operations to build up enough credits so that it will be classified as an adapting flow and allowed queue space. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clark et al. with credits and flow limits of Bechtolsheim et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do this since credit scheme ensures fair allocations of bandwidth. See column 10, lines 47-49.

9. Claims 1, 12, 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skirmont US 6,252,848 in view of Bechtolsheim et al. US 6,515,963.

Regarding claim 1, 24, the claimed sending rate estimate is disclosed by ingress flow rate. The claimed probabilistically marking a packet to one of a plurality of priority

Art Unit: 2666

levels based on sending rate estimate is disclosed by packets marked with a marking based on criteria including ingress flow rate measurements and flow profiles. See column 4, lines 7-59.

Skirmont discloses all of the limitations of the claims except for determining any credits or debits for the packet stream, wherein a probability marking of the packet stream is improved while there is sufficiently accumulated credit and when a first criterion is met. Bechtolsheim et al. discloses credit field in flow table for each indexed flow table entry so a flow over its dynamic buffer limit incurring a drop probability could send some amount of packets to exhausts credits. Credits are incremented on enqueueing and decremented on marking or dropping. See column 10, lines 1-35, column 12, lines 1-23. Once a flow exhausts its credits or reaches a minimum credit threshold level, it is deemed non-adaptive and a separate non-adaptive flow limit is enforced for that flow. A non-adaptive flow must stay under the flow limit for several queuing operations to build up enough credits so that it will be classified as an adapting flow and allowed queue space. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Skirmont with credits and flow limits of Bechtolsheim et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do this since credit scheme ensures fair allocations of bandwidth. See column 10, lines 47-49.

Regarding claims 12, 25, 26, the claimed means or metering tool for determining sending rate estimate is disclosed by monitoring of ingress flow rate of a plurality of flows by traffic monitors (Figure 1, elements M1-M3) with ingress monitors for each flow associated with a channel. See column 3, lines 14-32, column 4, lines 1-67. The

claimed means for probabilistically marking a packet to one of a plurality of priority levels based on sending rate estimate is disclosed by traffic monitor with packet marker which marks packets based on criteria including ingress flow rate measurements and flow profiles. See column 4, lines 7-59.

Skirmont discloses all of the limitations of the claims except for determining any credits or debits for the packet stream, wherein a probability marking of the packet stream is improved while there is sufficiently accumulated credit and when a first criterion is met. Bechtolsheim et al. discloses credit field in flow table for each indexed flow table entry so a flow over its dynamic buffer limit incurring a drop probability could send some amount of packets to exhausts credits. Credits are incremented on enqueueing and decremented on marking or dropping. See column 10, lines 1-35, column 12, lines 1-23. Once a flow exhausts its credits or reaches a minimum credit threshold level, it is deemed non-adaptive and a separate non-adaptive flow limit is enforced for that flow. A non-adaptive flow must stay under the flow limit for several queuing operations to build up enough credits so that it will be classified as an adapting flow and allowed queue space. At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Skirmont with credits and flow limits of Bechtolsheim et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do this since credit scheme ensures fair allocations of bandwidth. See column 10, lines 47-49.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

10. Claim 16 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Prior art of record does not disclose, in single or in combination, marking a data packet such that rate of packet marked a subordinate priority level is no greater than  $1-(FRT/s)$  in response to determination sending rate estimate is between a first rate threshold and a second threshold.

11. Claims 5-11, 17-22 are allowable over prior art.

Regarding claim 5, the prior art does not disclose if sending rate is between a first and second rate threshold, marking a packet such that a rate of packets marked a subordinate priority level is no greater than  $1-(FRT/s)$  in combination with other limitations of the claims.

Regarding claims 6, 17, the prior art does not disclose if sending rate is greater than second rate threshold, marking a packet such that the rate of packets marked a second priority level is  $(SRT - FRT)/s$  in combination with other limitations of the claims.

Regarding claims 8, 19, the prior art does not disclose if sending rate is greater than the rate threshold, determining if a burst size is greater than a minimum burst and in response that burst size is greater than minimum burst marking the packet a first priority level in combination with other limitations of the claims.

Regarding claims 10, 21, the prior art does not disclose if sending rate is greater than the super rate threshold, determining if a burst size is greater than a minimum

burst and in response that burst size is greater than minimum burst marking the packet a highest priority level in combination with other limitations of the claims.

### ***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments filed 7/18/2005 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues Skirmont fails to disclose or suggest determining credits or debits for packet stream. Examiner agrees and submits reference Bechtolsheim et al.

Applicant Lin et al. does not disclose the claimed limitations of a first probability using a first algorithm, at least one second probability using a second algorithm, the first and second algorithm being different and weighting each probability so that each contribute to net probability. Applicant argues the weighted average of Lin et al. is not computed based on the maximum and minimum threshold values so it does not suggest first, second probabilities determined using first and second algorithms and weighting each probability to contribute to a net probability. Examiner contends in WRED packet drop probability is based on maximum and minimum thresholds and a mark probability denominator. The rate of packet drop increases linearly as the average queue size increases until it reaches the maximum threshold and the mark probability denominator is the fraction of packets dropped when the average queue depth is at maximum threshold. Examiner interprets first algorithm as determination that minimum threshold cannot be set too low to result in unnecessary drops and second algorithm as determination of maximum threshold. Lin discloses the maximum and minimum

Art Unit: 2666

thresholds are set relative to one another such that the loss priorities associated with the classes of service are maintained. See column 2, lines 37-39. Examiner contends this teaches claim language of claim 23 involving weighting probabilities to result in net probability of marking a packet.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melanie Jagannathan whose telephone number is 571-272-3163. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 a.m.-4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on 571-272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJ  
9/28/05



**FRANK DUONG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**